

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**SANTOSH B. CHAND,**

**Defendant.**

**Case No. 06-cr-30129-DRH**

**ORDER**

**HERNDON, District Judge:**

Defendant Santosh Chand has filed a Motion to Continue (Doc. 19) the current trial setting in this matter, stating that the Government does not object to a continuance. Defendant was recently arraigned in this matter, and her attorneys, who entered their appearances on her behalf, have not had ample opportunity to prepare a defense, given that they have also not yet received discovery (*Id.* at ¶¶ 1-3). Further, attached to Defendant's Motion is her waiver of speedy trial.

Although there is a strong need to adhere to the tenets of the Speedy Trial Act, there are also reasons which, when weighed against this need, provide sufficient justification for a continuance. In this case, it appears a continuance is warranted as it failure to do so "would unreasonably deny the defendant or the Government . . . the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence." **18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv)**. Therefore,

the Court finds that pursuant to **18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A)**, the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and Defendant in a speedy trial. As such, the Court **GRANTS** Defendant's Motion to Continue (Doc. 19.) The Court **CONTINUES** the jury trial scheduled for Monday, December 4, 2006 at 9:00 a.m. to **Monday, May 14, 2007 at 9:00 a.m.** The time from the date the original Motion to Continue (Doc. 19) was filed, November 9, 2006, until the date to which the trial is rescheduled, May 14, 2007, is excludable time for the purposes of speedy trial.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 14<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2006.

/s/ David RHerndon  
**United States District Judge**